

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS
Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000400410011-4

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JULY 2 (legislative day JUNE 27), 1952.—Ordered to be printed

CONCLUSIONS

The Institute of Pacific Relations has not maintained the character of an objective, scholarly, and research organization.

The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence.

The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information including information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

A small core of officials and staff members carried the main burden of IPR activities and directed its administration and policies.

Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.

There is no evidence that the large majority of its members supported the IPR for any reason except to advance the professed research and scholarly purposes of the organization.

Most members of the IPR, and most members of its Board of Trustees, were inactive and obviously without any influence over the policies of the organization and the conduct of its affairs.

IPR activities were made possible largely through the financial support of American industrialists, corporations, and foundations, the majority of whom were not familiar with the inner workings of the organization.

The effective leadership of the IPR often sought to deceive IPR contributors and supporters as to the true character and activities of the organization.

Neither the IPR nor any substantial body of those associated with it as executive officers, trustees or major financial contributors, has ever made any serious and objective investigation of the charges that the IPR was infiltrated by Communists and was used for pro-Communist purposes.

Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000400410011-4

able and impressive screen for the activities of the IPR inner core, and as a defense when such activities came under scrutiny.

* * *

Owen Lattimore was, from some time beginning in the 1930's, a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy.

* * *

Effective leadership of the IPR had by the end of 1934 established and implemented an official connection with G. N. Voitinski, Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Communist International.

* * *

After the establishment of the Soviet Council of IPR, leaders of the American IPR sought and maintained working relationships with Soviet diplomats and officials.

* * *

The American staff of IPR, though fully apprised that the Soviet Council of IPR was in fact an arm of the Soviet Foreign Office, was simultaneously and secretly instructed to preserve the "fiction" that the Soviet council was independent.

* * *

IPR officials testified falsely before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee concerning the relationships between IPR and the Soviet Union.

* * *

Owen Lattimore testified falsely before the subcommittee with reference to at least five separate matters that were relevant to the inquiry and substantial in import.

* * *

John Paton Davies, Jr., testified falsely before the subcommittee in denying that he recommended the Central Intelligence Agency employ, utilize and rely upon certain individuals having Communist associations and connections. This matter was relevant to the inquiry and substantial in import.

* * *

The effective leadership of IPR worked consistently to set up actively cooperative and confidential relationships with persons in Government involved in the determination of foreign policy.

* * *

Over a period of years, John Carter Vincent was the principal fulcrum of IPR pressures and influence in the State Department.

* * *

It was the continued practice of IPR to seek to place in Government posts both persons associated with IPR and other persons selected by the effective leadership of IPR.

* * *

The IPR possessed close organic relations with the State Department through interchange of personnel, attendance of State Department officials at IPR conferences, constant exchange of information and social contacts.

* * *

The effective leadership of the IPR used IPR prestige to promote the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States.

A group of persons operating within and about the Institute of Pacific Relations exerted a substantial influence on United States far eastern policy.

* * *

The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives.

* * *

A group of persons associated with the IPR attempted, between 1941 and 1945, to change United States policy so as to accommodate Communist ends and to set the stage for a major United States policy change, favorable to Soviet interests, in 1945.

* * *

Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent were influential in bringing about a change in United States policy in 1945 favorable to the Chinese Communists.

* * *

During the period 1945-49, persons associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations were instrumental in keeping United States policy on a course favorable to Communist objectives in China.

* * *

Persons associated with the IPR were influential in 1949 in giving United States far eastern policy a direction that furthered Communist purposes.

* * *

A chief function of the IPR has been to influence United States public opinion.

* * *

Many of the persons active in and around the IPR, and in particular though not exclusively Owen Lattimore, Edward C. Carter, Frederick V. Field, T. A. Bisson, Lawrence K. Rosinger, and Maxwell Stewart, knowingly and deliberately used the language of books and articles which they wrote or edited in an attempt to influence the American public by means of pro-Communist or pro-Soviet content of such writings.

* * *

The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States.

* * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

LEGISLATION

The committee recommends speedy enactment of an adequate statute to permit congressional committees to require the testimony of a witness when it is determined such testimony is sufficiently important to justify extending to the witness immunity from prosecution with respect to the matters concerning which he testifies.

INVESTIGATIONS

The committee recommends:

(1) That a thorough study be made by the Committee on the Judiciary, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, of the Espionage Act and related legislation with a view to determining what revisions may be necessary to deal effectively with present-day security problems.

(2) That the Committee on Government Operations undertake an investigation to determine the need for and proper scope of legislation to require departments and agencies in the executive branch to make available to congressional committees upon proper request material from their files.

(3) That consideration be given to investigation by some appropriate agency of the following:

(a) Possible Communist infiltration into and influence upon the Treasury Department and other agencies forming and administering fiscal and monetary policies and affairs of the United States;

(b) The role of Alger Hiss in foreign affairs and the formulation of foreign policy of the United States and his influence on personnel decisions in the State Department;

(c) The extent to which persons actively associated with the pro-Communist core of the IPR have been employed by any agency of the Government, and the activities and influence of any such persons still so employed; and

(d) The extent to which contributions by American charitable, scientific, and educational foundations have aided Communist or pro-Communist activity in the United States.

DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITY

The committee recommends:

(1) That the Department of Justice submit to a grand jury the question of whether perjury has been committed before the subcommittee by Owen Lattimore.

(2) That the Department of Justice submit to a grand jury the question of whether perjury has been committed before the subcommittee by John P. Davies, Jr.